

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 20, 2003, applicants' assignee has amended the above-application to place it into form for allowance.

Allowability of the subject matter of claims 2-10, 13, 14, and 21 has been noted. Claim 2 has accordingly been placed into independent form and should now be allowable. Claims 3-10 originally were dependent from claim 2 and should now therefore be in form for allowance. Claims 13 and 14, dependent from claim 2, have been amended to improve their clarity, and should also be allowable. New claims 26 and 27, corresponding respectively to original claims 11 and 12, have been added, dependent from claim 2, and should be allowable, as well.

Claim 15, from which claim 21 originally depended, has been amended to include the limitations of claim 21, and should therefore now be in form for allowance. Claims 16 and 22-24 depend from claim 15 and should therefore also be allowable, together with claims 17-20, which depend from claim 16.

Rejected claim 1 has been canceled.

Original claim 11 was rejected as unpatentable over Gliebe in view of Goldenberg et al., and has now been rewritten in independent form and amended to recite additionally that, "a portion of said hook including said catch extends through said back member by way of said opening when said hook is engaged in

said receptacle." The receptacle to which the Examiner refers in Gliebe is a stud having a downwardly depending finger that is located on the back of the carrier. The opening through the back of Goldenberg's device is not a receptacle nor a hook, and the amendment of claim 11 clarifies that the opening recited as being included in the receptacle functions as a receptacle, since it receives a portion of the hook including the catch when the hook is engaged in the receptacle. Accordingly, claim 11, as amended, is not suggested by Gliebe in view of Goldenberg and should be found allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11 and should therefore be found allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 22 has been amended to agree with amended claim 15 and specifies the location of the ear originally mentioned in claim 21 and now mentioned as a part of claim 15. Claim 22 depends from now allowable claim 15 and should therefore be allowable, as amended.

Claim 23 also depends from claim 15 and should be found allowable for that reason. Claim 23 has been amended without changing its scope in order to make the claim more clearly readable.

Claim 25 was rejected as anticipated by Yamada, but it is submitted that claim 25 is not anticipated nor suggested by Yamada, since claim 25 requires an outwardly projecting ear on

each of the side members of the carrier, and a tool access opening defined in the lower end wall of the carrier. Yamada has no outwardly projecting ears on its side, but has inwardly directed rails to grip an object being carrier. Additionally, Yamada has no tool access opening defined in its lower end wall, which is uniformly of a single height across its entire expanse. Claim 25 has been amended to improve its readability and clarity, without changing its scope. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 25, as amended, should be allowed.

New claim 28 places original claim 22 into independent form, and like claim 25, recites a tool access opening defined in the lower end wall of the carrier. Claim 28 also recites "an inwardly-projecting grip member carried on one of [the] side members and an ear extending laterally outward from said side member adjacent said grip member." Accordingly, it is submitted that new claim 28, written to incorporate the limitations of original claim 22, including the limitations of original claim 15, is not anticipated by Yamada, that original claim 22 was not anticipated by Yamada, and that claim 28 should be allowed, together with new claim 29, dependent from claim 28, and adding the limitations of original claim 23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that claims 2-20 and 22-29, all of the claims remaining in the application, are now in form for allowance. Accordingly,

the Examiner is requested to reexamine the application, to allow all of the remaining claims, and to pass the application on promptly to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald B. Haslett
Reg. No. 28,855
Of Attorneys for Applicant
Tel: (503) 227-5631

Q:\Jennifer\wpdocs\DBH\LEATHERM\0756714\Amendment 031119.frm:11/20/3:10:46